

April 28, 1975

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 2039

In the context of this discussion of needs and functions, we would welcome an organizational initiative comprising the following elements:

1. A Council of Science and Technology Advisers in the Executive Office, headed by a strong chairperson, to provide continuing staff advice on scientific and technical aspects of domestic and foreign policy-making together with long-range policy research, planning, and public investment for the uses of the nation's scientific and technological resources in achieving major goals and objectives. At the discretion of the President, the head of the council could also serve as science adviser to the President.

An alternative to a council would be a single presidential appointee, assisted by a carefully chosen staff. This alternative would be appropriate in circumstances where a President might find a council unwieldy and slow-moving, and would prefer a simpler arrangement.

To ensure a strong and in-depth capability for planning and assessment to support policy-making, the Executive Office elements should be able to look to the National Science Foundation to mount and carry out a substantial level of science policy research, analysis, and reporting.

What matters, however, is not so much the organizational mechanics but rather the explicit provision for lively and complete presidential staff work—staff work which captures and gives weight to scientific and technical considerations in the examination and choice of policy alternatives and program strategies. The organizational answers should match the demands of the assignment, and should be seen as doing so.

2. An Office of Research and Development Management with the responsibility to evaluate programs, set priorities, provide quality assurance, see to policy coordination, and stimulate new initiatives. This office can be either a separate unit in the Executive Offices or an element in the OMB headed by a presidential appointee.

3. Principal reliance on the National Science Board and the director of the National Science Foundation, working closely with other federal scientific and technical agencies, for assessments of the nation's needs and opportunities for the advancement of science and education for science and engineering. Effective outreach should be maintained with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council, as well as with scientific, professional, and public interest groups.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Organizational inventions tend to lose vitality over time, and to become preoccupied with problems of the past rather than the future. Organizational lag is one of the afflictions of bureaucratic life. We believe that our suggestions are appropriate for as far ahead as we can look, but we strongly recommend that future administrations keep an open mind and open options as to the character and appropriations of any set of science policy and managerial institutions. Events may call for different arrangements, and the national policy machinery must have the ability to recognize the need for change and revitalization.

on H.R. 3000, held by the House Subcommittee on Employee Political Rights and Intergovernmental Programs, one of my constituents, Ronald Jones, presented his case for amending the Hatch Act. He said:

I believe that the evil of depriving any group of rights freely enjoyed by all others is far greater than the risk of abuse of official position by the few who might be unscrupulous no matter what the prevailing conditions are.

I would like to share the views of this Federal employee with my colleagues.

VIEWS OF RONALD JONES

Members of Congress and fellow-citizens, I want to express my most sincere gratitude for having been given the opportunity to offer my thoughts on H. R. 3000, the proposed amendment to the Hatch Act. My name is Ronald E. Jones, and for 5 years I have been an employee of the U. S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration. I am a member of Local 12 of the American Federation of Government Employees, and I am a constituent of Congressman Herbert Harris, whose interest in this proposed legislation I commend to my friends and neighbors in Alexandria, Virginia. Additionally, I have studied political science through George Washington University's excellent program in Legislative Affairs. However, I claim to speak for no organization, but regard myself as a "grass roots" spokesman with deep feelings about the issue under consideration.

I strongly favor enactment of H. R. 3000, which with some strengthening would reestablish the right of civil servants to participate in the partisan political process in a way that I believe can be consistent with maintaining an effective, impartial executive branch. I am proud to serve as a civilian employee of the government, but I want to be able to contribute more—just let me have the chance! Surely the Members of the Subcommittee entered public life for similar reasons.

I am one who knows what it feels like to be part of a disadvantaged minority, whose voice is muzzled and whose actions are manacled by the majority. We of the Federal civil service are deprived of some of the rights which others take for granted as self-evident and inalienable in a democracy: of being equally able to act and serve in our common political process. Other groups who are similarly deprived are convicted criminals and those in insane asylums. Do the American people really intend that their Civil Servants should be so equated?

The intentions of the Hatch Act are laudable in encouraging a professional civil service impartially administering public business. As the Supreme Court recently reiterated: "it is in the best interest of the country, indeed essential, that federal service should depend upon meritorious performance rather than political service." But the barring of political activity does not guarantee a federal service dependant on meritorious performance. Further, I believe that voluntary service in the political arena can make a positive impact on the performance of those who choose to participate, by inculcating new human skills and awareness and by expanding the breadth of one's perspective.

The key word in the phrase "partisan political activity", from which the Hatch Act excludes us, in the word "partisan", which Title 5, Part 733, Subpart A of the Code of Federal Regulations defines as "a political party." My copy of the U.S. Constitution neither permits nor forbids political parties, it does not mention them because they were not invented until some years after Ratification. I need not remind Members of the Subcommittee that, by far, most of the policy debate and resolution which so vitally

affects the lives of Americans is conducted within partisan political channels. Thus, although we have the vote, our exclusion from most stages of debate and all except final selections critically limits our choices; in effect, we can eat the menu offered, or we can leave the table hungry.

Besides the educational values of participation—which a number of Presidential candidates have noted—there are other reasons why I believe civil servants should participate. It would tend to develop our awareness of issues not usually connected with our employment but which might have bearing on the way we perform our work. There are those who criticize the Federal establishment for being unresponsive. If this were true, it could be because the avenues open to us to learn first hand the problems and needs of our countrymen through face-to-face encounters are inadequate.

We know that voting and political participation of all kinds have been declining at alarming rates in this country. It is easy enough to take a complacent attitude towards letting others conduct the policy-making business of the country. Certainly with a ban like the Hatch Act, we are provided with a too-simple excuse to ignore the responsibilities of citizenship. Further, can the nation afford to do without the political services, experience, support, and commitment of so large a portion of the adult population? I don't think so.

Similarly, I believe participation of civil servants would help raise the level of debate in the political process, bringing wealths of new expertise, experience, and approaches into the marketplace of ideas. Who knows better than those expected to carry out the law of the land, the difficulties and complexities of achieving the intent of legislation, which is but the collective will of the public.

The Hatch Act does not simply prevent my participation at the Federal level, but at State and local levels as well. In a partisan context—which is about the only context there is—I cannot even support my local dog-catcher without possibly running afoul of the law. Because of the Hatch Act, I and others like me have perhaps the least voice in the areas which affect us most, such as property taxation or in school allocations—if they fall in a partisan division.

As a possible new source of time and talent, to the extent that we would participate—if permitted—we would help revive and strengthen the two-party system, thus helping insure that there will always be a choice.

In the final analysis, I believe the evil of depriving any group of rights freely enjoyed by all others is far greater than the risk of abuse of official position by the few who might be unscrupulous no matter what the prevailing conditions are. Besides, the amendment would continue to provide strong safeguards against criminal abuse of position. Thus, we are not merely trading greater freedom for more criminality. Events of the past few years are graphic demonstration that even the Hatch Act cannot prevent abuse. In any case, whether or not improper pressures are used depends on the character, ethical integrity, and commitment to duty of those who are bound to abide by the law. The Framers of the Constitution intended that all citizens—including civil servants—could be trusted to govern themselves. It is time to restore that trust, to extend it to civil servants.

With regard to improving the proposed legislation, I believe it is vital to better define what is meant by "use of official position to influence the outcome of elections." This definition could be so vague that many of us would still refrain from participating so as to take no chance of being in the wrong. I also think the prohibition should be extended to preclude use of official position to

HATCH ACT REVISIONS SUPPORTED

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1975

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, at the April 14 hearings in northern Virginia

E 2040

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

April 28, 1975

promote the interests of a political party, particularly in non-election seasons. It might also be wise to prohibit the use for political purposes of information gained in confidence through official employment.

To help insure that participation would be above suspicion and to help us protect ourselves, it might be desirable to set up a reporting system outside normal official channels to which we might file notices of intent to participate, log our activities and file periodic reports.

Regarding possible abuse of official position, it would be valuable to specify a difference between effects which may have been intended, and from those which may have been inadvertent or unforeseeable side effects of particular administrative decisions. This raises the interesting question, too, of whether a defeated candidate could sue for a new election if he suspected improper interference by civil servants.

As I read H.R. 3000, it would be impossible for cabinet officers or other well-known political appointees to campaign, because they would be unable to disassociate themselves from their official positions. If this interpretation is accurate, it might make for a more evenly matched contest, but it also might unduly reduce the ability of incumbents to persuade, inform, and generate support for their positions.

I believe my fellow-panelists will have other suggestions for improving the legislation.

To conclude, if the definition of prohibited behavior can be nailed down and if the monitoring and oversight processes can be strengthened, I heartily urge others to join me in support of the adoption of H.R. 3000. I know this change would help bring a breath of air to freshen the holds where we who are "Hatched", wait. My thanks to Members of Congress for taking a new look at the political limbo in which we serve.

I would be pleased at this time to answer questions or clarify my statement.

MEETING FUTURE ENERGY REQUIREMENTS

HON. HAROLD RUNNELS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1975

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, because of an abundance of natural resources, the State of New Mexico has played a leading role in national oil and gas production in past years. Like the rest of the Nation, our State is confronted with the problem of meeting future energy requirements. As a result, a wide range of projects by local, State, and Federal agencies, our universities, and private business firms are being undertaken today to develop the technology necessary for providing energy for the future.

The energy research projects being conducted in our State include studying the merit and potential of such energy sources as solar, geothermal, atomic, laser, and gasification.

Each of these various forms of energy hold the promise of meeting some of our future energy requirements to replace depleting fossil fuels. However, during the next 15 to 20 years the primary energy supply will continue to come both directly and indirectly from fossil fuel, and therefore, the coal gasification proc-

ess holds the promise of being best able to meet our immediate needs.

Preparations have been underway for some time for El Paso Natural Gas Co. and Western Gasification Co.—Wesco—to construct and operate six coal gasification plants and necessary support facilities in northwestern New Mexico on the Navajo Indian Reservation.

As expected with any new project, public concerns have been and will continue to be expressed about the environmental impact of this new process in which coal is converted into other petroleum products. Because the residents of my State have an interest in not only developing new energy sources but also in protecting the clean air environment of our State, I have sought to become as well informed as possible on the gasification process.

Recently, I had the opportunity to go to the Republic of South Africa to gain first-hand knowledge on the coal gasification technology that is proposed for operating the New Mexico gasification plants.

Unlike the United States, South Africa has no domestic petroleum reserves. But they have been able to largely overcome this deficiency by intensive coal gasification. In fact, the South African Coal, Oil, and Gas Corp.—SASOL—is presently preparing to expand their plant tenfold.

To say that I was impressed with South Africa's program is an understatement. The opportunity to visit this unique facility answered many of my questions and also raised some new issues which I feel should be pursued.

South Africa is known as a country that likes to be independent. Because of their remote location, and the world political situation, they are also confronted with a requirement of being able to function independently. Dr. Edward Teller, a world-renowned energy expert, after observing the SASOL facilities was quoted in the Johannesburg Star as stating that the Arabs would soon realize that the best place for their oil is not underground because technology was soon going to provide a replacement, the technology being South Africa's SASOL plant.

SASOL has been described as the "South African industrial whiz kid" in the field of gas, petroleum, and chemicals. Gasoline produced by the plant represents only a portion of the production which has resulted in the operation of the facility at a profit, even before world gas and oil prices reach new highs.

Because the gasification technology also converts undesirable components in coal, such as sulfur, into chemical forms that can be removed from the product gas, the process produces a wide range of chemicals which add to the profitability of the operation.

The following table provides an example of SASOL's major output:

Products in barrels/day	
Gasoline	3,675
Kerosene	45
Diesel fuel	365
Fuel oil	90
Wax and waxy oil	295
Methanol	15

Ethanol	310
Methyl ethyl ketone	22
Acetone	16

Because of its leadership in gasification technology, South Africa today is selling its knowledge to many Western nations including the United States. They are also conducting new research to improve the technique that will allow this country, small by U.S. standards, to become completely independent of foreign energy sources.

In New Mexico, WESCO hopes to have the first plant in operation in a couple of years and producing an average of 250 million cubic feet of synthetic natural gas. I am convinced that we will be able to work out the various economical and environmental problems.

As New Mexico has so often in the past on the development of new technology, we will be providing the talents and natural resources of our State for the good of the Nation.

THIS IS THE YEAR OF BROOKLYN

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1975

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this article for extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE BLOOMING OF DOWNTOWN BROOKLYN

This is the year of Brooklyn, but you'd never know it in New York. The season's top theatrical event—the visit of England's Royal Shakespeare Company—took place in Brooklyn, at the handsomely restored Brooklyn Academy of Music. Generally, it is easier to get New Yorkers to cross the Atlantic to London than to cross the East River.

Politically, as well as culturally, it is the year of Brooklyn, with a Brooklyn man in City Hall and a Brooklyn man in the State Capitol at Albany, which gives Brooklyn both clout and cachet. And with Manhattan marking time in an atmosphere of recession and gloom, most of what is happening in New York is going on quietly across the river.

Actually, the blooming of downtown Brooklyn should not really take New Yorkers so very much by surprise. It wouldn't if they didn't keep looking the other way. A walk across the Brooklyn Bridge on a magical early spring day or evening reveals more than its accustomed romantic beauty. (How spoiled we New Yorkers are; but this is part of our dubious charm.) Downtown Brooklyn has no easy answer and is still fraught with real and continuing problems, but there is enough visible accomplishment in terms of design, development and the creation and reinforcement of community and amenity for a dozen other cities.

Brooklyn's lessons in architecture and urbanism—which largely involve informed efforts to turn around an area decimated by a residential and commercial flight to the suburbs of the 1950's and 1960's—are heartening. And so are the role and achievements of the city agency in charge, the Office of Downtown Brooklyn Development, now under the direction of Richard M. Rosan, working in collaboration with exceptionally strong and dedicated local groups. This is one of those on-the-spot Mayor's planning offices that have done more for New York in terms of positive development policy than any single idea or action initiated by city government